

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/634,894	Applicant(s) BECKMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner In Suk Bullock	Art Unit 1764	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) In Suk Bullock. (3)_____.

(2) Mr. Daniel Evans. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 November 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: 10/467,844.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

In Suk Bullock
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed strategies for overcoming the outstanding rejections(s). To overcome the double patenting rejection, Mr. Evans proposed amending claim 1 to include the limitation wherein 0.1 to 20% of the ion exchanger is neutralized (page 22 of specification has a showing of improved selectivity for C8 when the ion exchanger is partially neutralized). It was also proposed to amend claim 1 wherein principal C4 is isobutene and to amend claim 15 wherein principal C4 is 1-butene. None of the proposed amendments would overcome the outstanding rejections.